

the General Assembly should by rule permit bills to continue beyond the life of the session in which they are introduced.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Willis, only one more question. Delegate Hanson's time has expired.

DELEGATE WILLIS: I have two questions. Maybe I can put them together as one.

*(Laughter.)*

You say the legislature could override this veto within ten days, but suppose the legislature were not in session? Would it be necessary for them to come back into special session for this purpose? I know you allowed this, but it is both awkward and expensive to operate in that manner.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Hanson.

DELEGATE HANSON: The way the proposal is written, the technical answer to your question is yes. The practical answer, however, is that by requiring that the budget be enacted by the 80th day this would give the General Assembly at least an additional ten days before its date of adjournment. By that time the veto message should be returned. If it needs to stay in session an additional day or so to handle this problem, it can do so.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Adkins.

DELEGATE ADKINS: Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to section 6.07. The amendment is in the course of preparation.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is an amendment to amendment No. 2?

DELEGATE ADKINS: Yes, an amendment to amendment No. 2. The substance of the amendment would be to strike out in line 16 the word "estimate," and in line 17 the word "revenues," and substitute in their place the words "total budget expenditures," so that the sentence would then read, "Total appropriations included in the budget bill as enacted by the General Assembly shall not exceed the total budget expenditures submitted by the governor."

THE CHAIRMAN: Before considering it further, the Chair would ask Delegate Hanson whether he would be disposed to accept the amendment.

DELEGATE HANSON: I would be disposed to accept Delegate Adkins' amendment, if none of my co-sponsors has any objections.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are all the seconders of the amendment in the room, and does anybody object to the modification of the amendment in the manner suggested?

The suggested amendment is to change lines 16 and 18 so that they would read ". . . the General Assembly shall not exceed the total budget expenditures submitted by the governor."

Is that correct, Delegate Adkins?

DELEGATE ADKINS: My proposed language was "the total budget expenditures."

THE CHAIRMAN: "total budget expenditures submitted by the governor."

Delegate James.

DELEGATE JAMES: Point of inquiry.

THE CHAIRMAN: State the inquiry.

DELEGATE JAMES:—to Delegate Adkins.

Is this not in effect eliminating use of surpluses for any purposes of expenditure?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Adkins.

DELEGATE ADKINS: That is my hope, Delegate James. I think it would be catastrophic to permit the General Assembly to have a little bit of budgeted surplus to play with. It is my hope that this language will prevent that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do any other sponsors object to the modification?

For what purpose does Delegate Storm rise?

DELEGATE STORM: Mr. Chairman, I am not one of the sponsors. If they had asked me, I would have been.

I would object, if I may. If I may not, I will sit down.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think you have the right to object.

*(Laughter.)*

The amendment is modified by the sponsors so that it would read in lines 16 and 17 ". . . General Assembly shall not exceed the total budget expenditures submitted by the governor."

Delegate Storm, of course you have the right to offer an amendment that would take it back to the previous language or any other language you should so desire.

DELEGATE STORM: Mr. Chairman, it suits me to go right ahead and vote on this.